REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1 - 15 were noted as pending in the application, and all claims were rejected. By this amendment, claims 1, 3, 13, and 15 have been amended. Thus, claims 1 - 15 remain pending in the application. The rejections of the Office Action are traversed below.

Objections to the Specification

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has requested applicant provide support for the ambiguously claimed features from the instant specification. To the extent the Examiner has asserted deficiencies in the specification and/or the claims under 35 USC § 112 in the Office Action, the Applicant responds herein with either claim amendments, citations to the specification, and/or traversals. To the extent the Examiner believes certain claimed features are not supported by the specification, the Applicant presumes the Examiner has clearly and completely articulated all such objections and rejections in the Office Action, pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.104(b); MPEP § 706.

In item a), on page 2 of the Office Action, the specification is objected to because the title allegedly is not descriptive. The Applicant respectfully traverses this objection, noting that the present application describes and claims a method for extracting information from a database, which is consistent with the present title of "Method for Extracting Information from a Database" and in compliance with the requirements of MPEP § 606. Should the Examiner have a suggestion of a title which she believes to be descriptive of the invention, the Applicant would welcome her input .

In item b), on page 2 of the Office Action, the specification is objected to because a plurality of tables exist in the specification under Appendix A. In response to the Examiner's suggestion, the tables have been removed from the specification and have been added as Figures 3 - 6. All references to the tables as residing in Appendix A have been changed in the specification herein to refer to the respective Figures.

In item c), on page 3 of the Office Action, the specification is objected to as missing an abstract. The Applicant respectfully disagrees, noting that the present application is a national stage filing of a parent PCT application and that parent published PCT application

clearly has the abstract printed on the face page of the published application. However, in the interest of furthering prosecution of the application, the abstract of the application, as copied from the parent international application, has been added herein at the end of the specification.

In view of the above and the amendments to the specification and Figures here, withdrawal of the objections to the specification is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Claims

On pages 2 - 3 of the Office Action, the claims are objected to as not being properly numbered and being single-spaced. The claim listing included herein has been spaced at one and a half line spacing, consistent with MPEP § 608.01(m), and has had the claim lines renumbered, with each claim beginning with line number 1, for the convenience of the Examiner.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claim 14 is objected to because of typographical errors. Claim 14 has been amended herein to correct the typographical errors.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claim 15 is objected for omitting the recitations of features in the preceding claims that should be clearly stated individually. While the Applicant is unsure what claimed features are being asserted in the Office Action as lacking clarity, claim 15 has been amended herein for purposes of clarity and to further prosecution of the application and not for purposes of limitation.

Withdrawal of the corresponding objections to the claims is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 USC § 101

On pages 3 - 5 of the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended herein to clearly recite a computer implemented process whereby information stored in a database structure is processed by a computer to generate a final data structure of selectively extracted information from the database. Support for the computer implemented information extraction and presentation method can be found in the specification at least at page 3, lines 7 - 21; page 4, lines 5 - 11; page 7, lines 7 - 13; page 8, lines 4 - 6; page 8, line 32 - page 9, line 2; page 15,

11

lines 21 - 34.

The steps of Figure 2 and the elements of the claims are clearly discussed in the above-cited portions of the specification, disclosing the computer implemented process whereby at least one computer program can process the exemplary variables shown in Tables 1 - 3 of Fig. 1 and generate the extracted database information shown in Tables 17 and 18 of Fig. 5. In short, the information of the database is processed by a computer as recited in claim 1 and presented to the user in a tangible, changed form, thereby satisfying the requirements of the unpublished and nonprecedential Board opinion in Ex parte Bowman, 61 USPQ2d 1669, 1671 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 2001). In particular, Bowman stands for the proposition that tying an invention to a computer in the specification and the claims, as exemplified by the present specification and amended claim 1, satisfies the 35 USC § 101 requirement for the claimed invention to be within the technological arts. See also, Diamond v. Diehr, 450 US 175, 209 USPQ 1, 8-10 (1981).

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, as now amended, under 35 USC § 101 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1 - 15 under 35 USC §112

On pages 5 - 6 of the Office Action, claims 1 - 15 were rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to enable one skilled in the art to make or use the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action has cited three elements that are allegedly recited in claim 1 and has asserted that the three elements lack support in the specification. The Applicant respectfully disagrees and responds as follows. Item 1) is disclosed at least at page 8, lines 30 - 31; page 16, lines 14 - 18; and in Table 17 as an example of how the claimed invention partitions the information across the classification variables of "client" and "year." Item 2) is clearly disclosed at least at page 8, line 32 - page 9, line 2. As regards defining the metes and bounds of the boundary tables and connecting tables, no such element is recited in claim 1. Contrary to the unsupported assertions by the Examiner, exemplary embodiments are expressly designed to avoid specific limitations on table sizes and dimensions. See, for example, specification at page 7, lines 7 - 26; page 8, line 32 - page 9, line 2; page 15, line 21

- page 16, line 2.

The Office Action has rejected claims 2 - 14 under the same basis as rejecting claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 - 14 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 was rejected regarding the language "any one of the preceding claims." The offending language has been removed herein by amendment, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph.

Rejection of Claims 1 - 15 under 35 USC §112

On pages 6 - 9 of the Office Action, claims 1 - 15 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As regards the rejection of claim 1, the respective variables represent those data elements of the database that can be selected, analyzed, and made the subject of the mathematical function for the selective extraction of information from a database. See, for example, specification at page 6, line 33 - page 7, line 4; page 8, lines 22 - 31; page 9, lines 29 - 34; page 15, lines 21 - 34; Tables 1 - 5, 17, and 18.

As regards the rejection of claim 2, the Applicant notes that no specific rejection of claim 2 has been asserted in the Office Action. Accordingly, the Applicant is unable to respond to the rejection of claim 2.

As regards the rejection of claim 3, the feature of reading data records of the database into the memory of the computer is a further limitation of exemplary embodiments, but is not required for the novel features as recited in claim 1. Clearly, if the data records are already in memory, which is not precluded by the embodiment recited in claim 1, the steps of claim 1 can process completely. While the reading of the data records can occur early in the process, as observed by the Examiner, nothing in the application requires the read step to first occur. See specification at page 4, lines 5 - 9. Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully asserts that no section of the rules or statutes renders a dependent claim invalid because of the order the claim follows an independent claim, unless the dependent claims lacks antecedent basis, which is not the case nor the rejection here. Finally, the Applicant is permitted to claim his

13

or her invention broadly, which is the effect of reciting an independent claim followed by various dependent claims. See MPEP § 608.01(m).

As regards the rejection of claim 4, the reasons supporting the validity of claim 3 apply equally well here.

As regards the rejection of claim 5, the snowflake structure and its formation is described in the specification at least at page 8, lines 10 - 21 in conjunction with Fig. 1

As regards the rejection of claim 6, the description of boundary tables and connecting tables and their designation is described at least at page 8, line 32 - page 9, line 16 in conjunction with Fig. 1.

As regards the rejection of claim 7, there is no recitation of "links" in this claim. As regards the recited tables of claim 7, these features are described at least at page 8, line 32 - page 9, line 34.

As regards the rejection of claims 8 and 9, the features of these claims are discussed at least at page 9, line 35 - page 15, line 34. As regards what kind of artificial intelligence was used, no such feature is expressly recited in either of these claims.

As regards the rejection of claims 10 and 11, the Applicant notes that no specific rejection of claims 10 or 11 has been asserted in the Office Action. Accordingly, the Applicant is unable to respond to the rejection of claims 10 and 11.

As regards the rejection of claim 12, the elimination of a classification variable, as discussed at least at page 13, line 29 - page 15, line 34; Tables 15 - 18, serves to reduce a dimension of the intermediate data structure to ultimately generate the final, desired data structure showing the extracted information.

As regards the rejection of claim 13, evaluation of the mathematical function produces the results of the mathematical function operating on the values of the classification variables, which is the desired information to be extracted from the database. See, for example, page 15, lines 21 - 34; Tables 15 - 18.

As regards the rejection of claim 14, element b) of this claim has been amended herein, changing the feature to recite "processing through said boundary table towards said starting table." Support for this feature can be found at least at page 9, line 26 - page 10, line 34; page 16, line 35 - page 17, line 17.

14

As regards the rejection of claim 15, the Applicant notes that no specific rejection of claim 15 has been asserted in the Office Action other than aggregating the rejections of claims 1 - 14 into claim 15. For the reasons expressed above regarding the rejections of claims 1 - 14 and because claim 15 has been amended herein to remove the "any one of the preceding claims" language, the Applicant respectfully asserts the rejection of claim 15 is no longer applicable.

For the reasons presented above, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 - 15 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Summary

It is submitted that each of the objections and rejections presented in the Office Action has been addressed. Since no art rejection was presented in the Office Action, the Applicant respectfully submits claims 1 - 15 are deemed to be in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. If any fees are required in connection with this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: _____

William N. Hughet
Reg. No. 44,481

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-0404
Telephone: (703) 836-6620
Facsimile: (703) 836-2021

Date: __April 29, 2004__

15